



BULLETIN

OF THE

BROOKLYN ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XIV

FEBRUARY, 1919

No. 1

RELATION OF THE SYSTEMATIST TO THE ECONOMIC WORKER.

BY EDMUND H. GIBSON, Washington, D. C.

If in the furtherance of that branch of science called entomology the work of either the systematist or of the economist was agreed to be inferior to the other in importance there would be no object for this short treatise upon the relation of the one to the other. During the past five years I have heard frequently the mistaken statement made by economic workers that the systematist feels that the field men are his tools to supply material and to aid in the necessary biological studies, because he holds that the classification or reclassification of particular groups is the major part of entomology. On the other hand, especially among inexperienced economic workers, the opinion is often expressed that the identification of specimens is the only excuse for having systematists.

Conditions of to-day in every branch of activity prove that the successful prosecution of any endeavor is directly dependent upon all factors that enter into the problem or propaganda. The great war illustrates that no unit of force can act independently. Especially is this a truth in entomology. The economic workers or the combatant force in the unending fight upon insect pests must look to the strictly biological and systematic workers for the essentials that they alone can supply.

At this time, however, it must be admitted that the results of the economic workers are of greater importance to the world than those of the purely systematic, although it is at no time to be admitted that the work of either is of greater import to the

furtherance of the subject of entomology. It is therefore essential that the systematist lend all the assistance he possibly can to those in the field who are carrying on control measures. And indeed this assistance can count for much.

Allow me to point out a few ways in which this can be done. First, by the prompt determination of specimens sent in by the field men, and a return of the specimens whenever possible. Second, by supplying needed references and complete bibliographies of insects that are being studied. There is much in the library of nearly all systematists that would be of great value to economic workers and could easily be made available by a little more willingness on the part of both to co-operate. Third, by limiting for the time being his monographic work to groups that are of economic importance.

In return for these helps the economic worker should be willing to supply full data and as much as he can when submitting specimens for identification and then have a reasonable amount of patience in waiting for the determinations.

In the way of constructive criticism I venture to say that the foundation of any misunderstandings between these two groups of entomologists lies in the ignorance that one may have of the other's work. There are many, especially young entomologists, who have absolutely no taxonomic knowledge of a single group of insects,—even some who have been in entomology for years who would come in this class. Then too there are men who from time to time attempt a piece of systematic work and who go to the field only to collect and never even inquire into the activities of the biological or economic worker.

This condition however prevalent it may seem to be should and could be eliminated by requiring young men, starting in the profession of entomology, to choose some small and well defined group of insects for taxonomic study and also by requiring the young men contemplating systematic work to spend the greater part of at least two years doing biological and economic field work.

For the future advancement of entomology, workers in a particular branch of the subject must have a better appreciation of the problems of the other branches.

While the world to-day looks primarily to the economic worker it must not be overlooked that the development of entomology depends also upon the strictly biologic and systematic workers. The whole is made up of its parts.

PAPILIO CRESPHONTES, VAR. MAXWELLI, NOV.

BY GEORGE FRANCK, St. Petersburg, Fla.

The triangular spot near the apex of the primaries is entirely filled out with sulphur yellow, giving the specimen a striking tropical appearance.



FIG. 1. *P. crespontes*.



FIG. 2. *P. crespontes* var. *maxwelli*.

This variety is named after my esteemed friend Mrs. J. B. Maxwell, of Faribault, Minn.